

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 10-15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,535). The Examiner has indicated that Narayanaswami teaches all of the claim limitations of Claims 10 and 15.

The Examiner indicates that Narayanaswami teaches “providing an email application not configured for use over a wireless connection on a handheld computer at column 10, lines 9-12. To this assertion, Applicants disagree. What is disclosed in Narayanaswami is that software on the device (transcoder software converts received data into a format which is used by the device or other devices). Converting received data by the device is not the same as providing an email application that is not configured for use over a wireless connection. Narayanaswami does not describe providing any type of email application that is not configured for use over a wireless connection. If one contends that the e-mail application is on the wristwatch, Applicants would submit that Applicants’ claim that the e-mail application is on the handheld computer and the launching application is on the handheld computer and modifies parameters of the handheld computer. The Examiner appears to contend that the application that changes parameters is on the dock protocol adapter. Applicants have claimed that the handheld computer has both the launching application that changes parameters and the e-mail application.

With regard to independent claim 10, Applicants have claimed in claim 10 use of an e-mail application that was not intended to be used with a handheld computer with wireless communication capabilities. Therefore, the e-mail application provided in claim 10 is “not

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

configured for use over a wireless connection.” Narayanaswami does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of an e-mail application that is not configured for use over a wireless connection. What is taught by Narayanaswami is a transcoding application which converts data from one form to another. This is not an e-mail application as claimed by Applicants.

With regard to independent claim 15, Applicants have claimed in claim 15 use of an application that was not intended to be used with a handheld computer. Therefore, the application provided in claim 15 is “not configured not configured to run on the handheld computer.” Narayanaswami does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of an application that is not configured to run on a handheld computer. What is taught by Narayanaswami is a transcoding application which enables data to be converted from an original format to a format which may be more suitable for a smaller device, such as the wristwatch device described. Narayanaswami does not describe the enabling use of an application on an unintended platform, rather Narayanaswami teaches enabling the use of data on a device which it was not intended for.

Further, the Examiner indicates that Narayanaswami discloses modifying parameters of the handheld computer, by the launching application, so that the e-mail application is able to use a wireless connection. Applicants respectfully submit that this claim limitation is not taught or disclosed by Narayanaswami. Narayanaswami teaches converting data in one format to data in a second format so that it can be easily viewed on a smaller device. Applicants claim 10 recites “modifying parameters of the handheld computer...”, whereas Narayanaswami teaches modifying data transmitted to the smaller device. This is not the modification of parameters for the handheld computer, rather than simply a conversion of data. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the parameters in Applicants claim 10 are modified by the launching application which is on the handheld computer, whereas Narayanaswami teaches modifying data on one device using transcoder software and then transmitting the converted data to a second device to be used by the second device. Further still, Applicants respectfully submit that the modification of parameters in claim 10 is to enable the e-mail application to use a wireless connection. Nothing in Narayanaswami teaches modifying parameters of a handheld computer so that a wireless connection can be used.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

With regard to claim 15, Narayanaswami does not disclose modifying parameters of the handheld computer, by the launching application, so that the application is able to run on the handheld computer. Narayanaswami teaches converting data in one format to data in a second format so that it can be easily viewed on a smaller device. Applicants claim 15 recites "modifying parameters of the handheld computer...", whereas Narayanaswami teaches modifying data transmitted to the smaller device. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the parameters in Applicants claim 15 are modified by the launching application which is on the handheld computer, whereas Narayanaswami teaches modifying data on one device using transcoder software and then transmitting the converted data to a second device to be used by the second device. Further still, Applicants respectfully submit that the modification of parameters in claim 15 is to enable the application to run on the handheld computer. Nothing in Narayanaswami teaches modifying parameters of a handheld computer so that the application can be run on the handheld computer.

Applicants note that if the references do not teach all of the claim limitations recited, the claims are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of independent Claims 10 and 15 and their respective dependent claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants submit that Claims 16-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims rejected under § 103 are dependent claims which depend from Claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants have not specifically responded to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 but are reliant on the fact that the Applicants believe Claim 15 to be allowable. Therefore, Applicants believe that Claims 16-20 are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

* * * * *

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 8, 2005

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5730
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,603